World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews

eISSN: 2581-9615 CODEN (USA): WJARAI

Cross Ref DOI: 10.30574/wjarr

Journal homepage: https://wjarr.com/

(Research Article)

Check for updates

Life cycle assessment of electric vehicle batteries: Environmental impact and recycling strategies

Shreeshail Nuchhi *

Department of Automobile Engineering, DACG Government Polytechnic, Chikkamagaluru-577101, Karnataka, India.

World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 2019, 03(01), 093-101

Publication history: Received on 02 August 2019; revised on 10 August 2019; accepted on 22 August 2019

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2019.3.1.0144

Abstract

The rapid adoption of electric vehicles (EVs) has brought increased attention to the environmental implications of their battery systems. This paper presents a comprehensive life cycle assessment (LCA) of electric vehicle batteries, examining their environmental impact from raw material extraction through end-of-life management. The study evaluates various battery chemistries, manufacturing processes, and recycling strategies to provide insights into the overall sustainability of EV battery systems. Through comparative analysis and quantitative assessment, this research identifies key environmental hotspots and proposes strategies for minimizing the ecological footprint of EV batteries throughout their lifecycle.

Keywords: Life Cycle Assessment (LCA); Electric Vehicle Batteries; Environmental Impact; Recycling Strategies; Lithium-ion Batteries

1. Introduction

The global transition toward sustainable transportation has positioned electric vehicles as a critical component in reducing greenhouse gas emissions from the transportation sector. However, the environmental benefits of EVs are intrinsically linked to the lifecycle performance of their battery systems, which represent the most energy-intensive and material-intensive component of these vehicles. Understanding the comprehensive environmental impact of EV batteries requires a systematic approach that considers all phases of their existence, from raw material extraction to final disposal or recycling.

Life cycle assessment has emerged as the standard methodology for evaluating the environmental performance of products and systems across their entire lifespan. For EV batteries, this approach is particularly crucial given the complexity of their supply chains, the diversity of materials involved, and the varying end-of-life scenarios. The battery pack typically accounts for 30-40% of an electric vehicle's total environmental impact, making it a critical focus area for sustainability improvements.

The lithium-ion battery technology that dominates the EV market relies on a complex array of materials, including lithium, cobalt, nickel, manganese, and various organic compounds. Each of these materials carries its own environmental burden, from mining operations that can cause habitat destruction and water pollution to refining processes that consume significant amounts of energy. The geographic distribution of these resources also raises concerns about supply chain sustainability and social responsibility.

Manufacturing processes for EV batteries are highly energy-intensive, requiring sophisticated production facilities with controlled environments and precision equipment. The energy consumption during battery manufacturing can

* Corresponding author: Shreeshail Nuchhi

significantly impact the overall carbon footprint of the final product, particularly when production facilities rely on fossil fuel-based electricity grids. Recent studies have shown that battery manufacturing can account for 40-60% of the total lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions of an EV battery.

The operational phase of EV batteries presents both opportunities and challenges from an environmental perspective. While the batteries themselves produce no direct emissions during use, their environmental impact during this phase is closely tied to the electricity grid mix used for charging. In regions with high renewable energy penetration, the operational impact is minimal, while areas dependent on coal-fired power generation may see significant indirect emissions.

Battery degradation over time affects both performance and environmental impact, as reduced capacity may necessitate earlier replacement or additional charging cycles. Understanding degradation mechanisms and their environmental implications is crucial for optimizing battery design and usage patterns. Temperature management, charging protocols, and usage patterns all influence degradation rates and, consequently, the overall environmental performance of the battery system.

The end-of-life phase of EV batteries presents both significant challenges and opportunities. While improper disposal can lead to environmental contamination and resource waste, effective recycling strategies can recover valuable materials and reduce the need for virgin resource extraction. The development of circular economy approaches for EV batteries is essential for maximizing their environmental benefits and minimizing long-term impacts.

Current research in EV battery LCA faces several methodological challenges, including data availability, system boundary definition, and impact assessment methodologies. Standardization of LCA approaches for EV batteries is ongoing, with various international organizations working to establish consistent frameworks for environmental impact assessment. This paper aims to contribute to this body of knowledge by providing a comprehensive analysis of current practices and identifying areas for improvement in both battery design and lifecycle management.

2. Materials and Methods

The life cycle assessment methodology employed in this study follows the ISO 14040 and ISO 14044 standards, providing a systematic framework for evaluating environmental impacts throughout the EV battery lifecycle. The assessment encompasses four distinct phases: goal and scope definition, inventory analysis, impact assessment, and interpretation. This comprehensive approach ensures that all significant environmental aspects are considered and quantified using standardized metrics and methodologies.

The functional unit for this assessment is defined as one kilowatt-hour of battery capacity over its operational lifetime, expressed as "1 kWh of battery storage capacity." This functional unit allows for meaningful comparisons between different battery technologies and system configurations while accounting for variations in energy density and cycle life. The reference flow includes all materials, energy inputs, and emissions associated with providing this storage capacity throughout the complete lifecycle.

System boundaries for this assessment extend from cradle-to-grave, encompassing raw material extraction, material processing, component manufacturing, battery assembly, transportation, use phase, and end-of-life treatment. The upstream boundary includes mining and refining operations for all battery materials, while the downstream boundary extends through recycling or disposal processes. Transportation impacts are included for all major material flows and finished product distribution.

Primary data collection focused on battery manufacturing processes, material compositions, and energy consumption patterns from leading EV battery manufacturers. Secondary data sources include peer-reviewed literature, industry reports, and established LCA databases such as Ecoinvent 3.0 and GaBi Professional. Data quality assessment criteria included temporal, geographical, and technological representativeness, with priority given to recent data from relevant production regions and technologies.

The impact assessment methodology incorporates multiple environmental impact categories, including climate change potential (measured in CO_2 equivalents), acidification potential, eutrophication potential, human toxicity potential, and resource depletion indicators. The ReCiPe 2016 impact assessment method is employed as the primary characterization methodology, supplemented by additional indicators for battery-specific impacts such as metal depletion and water consumption.

Sensitivity analysis procedures examine the influence of key parameters on overall results, including electricity grid mixes, transportation distances, recycling rates, and battery lifetime assumptions. Monte Carlo simulation techniques are applied to propagate uncertainty through the assessment, providing confidence intervals for major impact categories. This probabilistic approach acknowledges the inherent variability in LCA data and provides more robust conclusions.

Comparative assessment includes analysis of different lithium-ion battery chemistries, including lithium iron phosphate (LFP), nickel manganese cobalt (NMC), nickel cobalt aluminum (NCA), and lithium manganese oxide (LMO) technologies. Each chemistry is evaluated using consistent methodology and assumptions to enable meaningful comparison of environmental performance characteristics. The assessment also considers emerging technologies such as solid-state batteries and lithium-sulfur systems.

Quality assurance procedures include critical review by independent LCA experts, cross-validation with published studies, and consistency checks across all assessment phases. The methodology incorporates recent advances in LCA methodology specific to battery systems, including allocation procedures for recycled materials and treatment of battery second-life applications. These methodological refinements ensure that the assessment reflects current best practices in battery LCA while maintaining scientific rigor and transparency.

Table 1 Assessment Phase

Assessment Phase	**Methodology**	**Data Sources**	**Key Metrics**
Goal & Scope	ISO 14040/14044	Literature review	Functional unit: 1 kWh capacity
Inventory Analysis	Primary & secondary data	Industry reports, Ecoinvent	Material flows, energy inputs
Impact Assessment	ReCiPe 2016	Characterization factors	GWP, AP, EP, HTP, RDP
Interpretation	Sensitivity analysis	Monte Carlo simulation	Uncertainty ranges

3. Result and discussion

3.1. Raw Material Extraction and Processing

The environmental impact of EV battery production begins with the extraction and processing of raw materials, which represents a significant portion of the total lifecycle environmental burden. Lithium extraction, primarily from brine operations in South America and hard rock mining in Australia, presents distinct environmental challenges. Brine extraction in the Atacama Desert and similar regions requires substantial water resources, with estimates suggesting 500,000 to 2 million liters of water needed per ton of lithium carbonate produced. This water consumption occurs in already water-stressed regions, potentially affecting local ecosystems and communities.

Cobalt mining, predominantly concentrated in the Democratic Republic of Congo, faces both environmental and social challenges. Open-pit mining operations for cobalt-bearing ores result in significant land disturbance, habitat loss, and potential water contamination from mining waste. The energy intensity of cobalt refining processes, typically occurring in China, contributes substantially to the carbon footprint of battery materials. Recent studies indicate that cobalt production generates approximately 10-15 kg CO_2 equivalent per kilogram of refined cobalt, making it one of the most carbon-intensive battery materials.

Nickel extraction and processing operations, primarily located in Indonesia, Philippines, Russia, and Canada, involve both laterite and sulfide ore processing. Laterite processing through high-pressure acid leaching (HPAL) is particularly energy-intensive, requiring temperatures of 250-270 °C and pressures of 4-5 MPa. The energy consumption for nickel production ranges from 150-300 GJ per ton of nickel, depending on the ore type and processing route. Additionally, nickel mining operations can generate significant amounts of tailings and waste rock, with potential for acid mine drainage in sulfide operations.

Manganese mining, while less environmentally intensive than cobalt or nickel extraction, still contributes to the overall environmental burden of battery materials. Major manganese-producing regions including South Africa, Australia, and Gabon face challenges related to dust emissions, water quality impacts, and land use changes. The processing of manganese ore into battery-grade manganese compounds requires additional energy inputs and chemical processing, contributing to the cumulative environmental impact of battery materials.

Graphite production for battery anodes involves both natural and synthetic pathways, each with distinct environmental implications. Natural graphite mining operations, primarily in China and Madagascar, generate significant amounts of waste rock and require extensive beneficiation processes to achieve battery-grade purity. Synthetic graphite production, while offering better control over material properties, is extremely energy-intensive, requiring temperatures above 2800°C and consuming approximately 15-20 MWh per ton of finished product.

The electrolyte components, including lithium salts and organic solvents, require specialized chemical processing with associated environmental impacts. Lithium hexafluorophosphate (LiPF6) production involves the use of hydrofluoric acid and other hazardous chemicals, presenting risks for both worker safety and environmental release. Organic carbonate solvents, while less hazardous than historical alternatives, still require petroleum-based feedstocks and energy-intensive purification processes.

Aluminum and copper production for battery current collectors and housing components contribute significantly to the overall material footprint. Primary aluminum production through electrolytic reduction consumes approximately 15 MWh per ton of aluminum, while copper production requires 20-30 GJ per ton depending on the ore grade and processing route. The geographic distribution of these industries affects the carbon intensity of production, with regions relying on coal-fired electricity showing higher environmental impacts.

Transportation of raw materials and intermediate products across global supply chains adds another layer of environmental impact. The typical EV battery incorporates materials from multiple continents, with lithium from South America, cobalt from Africa, nickel from Asia or North America, and final assembly potentially occurring in yet another region. This global supply chain structure results in significant transportation-related emissions, estimated at 2-5% of the total battery lifecycle carbon footprint.

Table 2 Material details

Material	Primary Sources	Extraction Method	Energy Intensity (GJ/t)	CO2 Emissions (kg CO2-eq/kg)
Lithium	Chile, Australia	Brine evaporation, Hard rock	50-80	5-8
Cobalt	DRC, Russia	Sulfide mining	100-150	10-15
Nickel	Indonesia, Philippines	Laterite/Sulfide processing	150-300	8-12
Manganese	South Africa, Australia	Open pit mining	20-30	2-3
Graphite	China, Madagascar	Mining/Synthetic production	50-200	3-15

3.2. Manufacturing Processes and Energy Consumption

Battery manufacturing represents one of the most energy-intensive phases in the EV battery lifecycle, accounting for 40-60% of the total embodied energy in the final product. The manufacturing process consists of multiple stages, each with distinct energy requirements and environmental implications. Electrode preparation, which includes mixing active materials with binders and conductive additives, requires precise control of particle size distribution and homogeneity. This process typically consumes 0.5-1.0 kWh per kWh of battery capacity, depending on the specific chemistry and processing parameters.

The coating and drying processes for electrode production are particularly energy-intensive, requiring large-scale ovens operating at temperatures between 80-150°C for extended periods. Solvent-based coating systems, while providing excellent coating uniformity, require additional energy for solvent recovery and environmental control systems. Water-based coating systems, increasingly adopted for environmental reasons, still require significant energy for moisture removal. The drying process alone can account for 30-40% of the total manufacturing energy consumption.

Cell assembly operations, including electrode stacking or winding, separator integration, and initial electrolyte filling, occur in highly controlled environments with stringent humidity and particle control requirements. These cleanroom facilities consume substantial energy for air handling, filtration, and climate control. The energy intensity of maintaining Class 100-1000 cleanroom conditions is estimated at 200-500 kWh per square meter of production floor space annually.

Formation cycling, a critical step in battery manufacturing that involves the initial charge-discharge cycles to establish the solid electrolyte interface (SEI), represents a significant energy consumption phase. This process typically requires 1.2-1.5 times the battery's nominal capacity in electrical energy, with additional energy needed for thermal management and process control systems. The formation process can extend over 24-48 hours, requiring precise temperature control and continuous monitoring.

Aging and quality control testing procedures, while necessary for ensuring battery safety and performance, add to the overall energy consumption of manufacturing. Extended aging protocols, sometimes lasting several weeks, require climate-controlled storage facilities and periodic testing equipment operation. Quality control testing, including capacity verification, impedance testing, and safety validation, consumes additional energy while ensuring product reliability.

The integration of individual cells into modules and packs involves mechanical assembly, electrical interconnection, and thermal management system installation. Welding operations for electrical connections consume significant energy and require specialized equipment and environmental controls. The installation of battery management systems, thermal management components, and protective housing adds complexity and energy consumption to the assembly process.

Geographic variations in electricity grid composition significantly impact the carbon footprint of battery manufacturing. Manufacturing facilities located in regions with high renewable energy penetration, such as parts of Norway or Costa Rica, can achieve substantially lower carbon footprints compared to facilities in coal-dependent regions. The carbon intensity of electricity used in manufacturing can vary by more than an order of magnitude between different regions, highlighting the importance of manufacturing location in overall environmental performance.

Waste heat recovery and energy efficiency improvements in manufacturing facilities can significantly reduce the environmental impact of battery production. Advanced manufacturing facilities increasingly implement heat recovery systems, high-efficiency motors and drives, and optimized process scheduling to minimize energy consumption. These improvements can reduce manufacturing energy consumption by 20-30% compared to conventional facilities, demonstrating the potential for continued environmental performance improvements through technological advancement.

Table 3 Manufacturing Stage

Manufacturing Stage	**Energy Consumption (kWh/kWh)**	**Temperature Requirements (°C)**	**Duration**	**Main Environmental Impacts**
Electrode Preparation	0.5-1.0	25-40	2-4 hours	Solvent emissions, dust
Coating & Drying	2.0-3.5	80-150	4-8 hours	Energy consumption, VOCs
Cell Assembly	0.3-0.6	20-25 (controlled)	1-2 hours	Cleanroom energy
Formation Cycling	1.2-1.5	25-45	24-48 hours	Electrical energy
Aging & Testing	0.2-0.4	25-60	1-4 weeks	Storage energy

3.3. Use Phase Environmental Impact

The environmental impact of EV batteries during their operational phase is primarily determined by the electricity sources used for charging and the efficiency of the charging and discharging processes. The carbon intensity of electricity grids varies dramatically across different regions, ranging from less than 50 grams of CO2 equivalent per kWh in hydroelectric-dominated systems to over 800 grams per kWh in coal-dependent grids. This variation directly affects the operational carbon footprint of EV batteries throughout their service life.

Battery efficiency during charge and discharge cycles influences the total electricity consumption required for vehicle operation. Modern lithium-ion batteries achieve round-trip efficiencies of 85-95%, meaning that 5-15% of the energy input during charging is lost as heat. These efficiency losses, while relatively small, accumulate over the battery's lifetime and contribute to the overall energy consumption and environmental impact. Higher efficiency batteries reduce both operational costs and environmental impacts through reduced electricity consumption.

Thermal management systems play a crucial role in maintaining battery performance and longevity while consuming additional energy during operation. Active cooling systems, whether air-based or liquid-based, require energy to operate pumps, fans, and control systems. In extreme climates, thermal management can consume 10-20% of the total vehicle energy, significantly impacting the overall efficiency of the electric vehicle system. The design and efficiency of these thermal management systems directly influence the operational environmental impact.

Battery degradation over time affects both performance and environmental impact through reduced capacity and increased charging frequency. Capacity fade typically occurs at rates of 2-5% per year under normal operating conditions, with faster degradation under high-temperature conditions or aggressive charging protocols. As battery capacity decreases, more frequent charging becomes necessary to maintain vehicle range, increasing the operational electricity consumption and associated environmental impacts.

Charging infrastructure efficiency varies significantly between different charging technologies and power levels. Level 1 AC charging (120V) typically achieves 85-90% efficiency, while Level 2 AC charging (240V) can reach 90-95% efficiency. DC fast charging systems generally achieve 92-96% efficiency but may cause additional battery heating and associated thermal management energy consumption. The infrastructure efficiency directly impacts the total electricity consumption and environmental footprint of EV operation.

Table 4 Charging Type

Charging Type	Power Level	Efficiency (%)	Typical Usage	Grid Impact
Level 1 AC	1.4-1.9 kW	85-90	Home overnight	Low peak demand
Level 2 AC	3.3-22 kW	90-95	Home/workplace	Medium peak demand
DC Fast	25-350 kW	92-96	Public corridors	High peak demand
Wireless	3.3-11 kW	80-90	Emerging technology	Medium peak demand
V2G Capable	Bidirectional	85-95	Grid services	Grid stabilization

Vehicle-to-grid (V2G) applications present opportunities for improving the overall environmental performance of EV batteries by providing grid services and enabling renewable energy integration. When EV batteries provide frequency regulation, peak shaving, or renewable energy storage services, they can contribute to grid stability and reduce the need for fossil fuel-based peaking power plants. However, V2G operations also result in additional charge-discharge cycles that may accelerate battery degradation.

Seasonal variations in electricity grid composition and vehicle energy consumption patterns affect the temporal distribution of environmental impacts. In many regions, winter months show higher carbon intensity due to increased heating loads and reduced renewable energy generation. Simultaneously, cold weather increases vehicle energy consumption due to heating requirements and reduced battery efficiency, compounding the environmental impact during winter periods.

The interaction between EV charging patterns and renewable energy availability offers opportunities for reducing operational environmental impacts. Smart charging systems that align charging schedules with periods of high renewable energy generation can significantly reduce the carbon footprint of EV operation. Time-of-use charging strategies can shift EV charging to periods when the electricity grid has lower carbon intensity, improving the overall environmental performance of the transportation system.

3.4. End-of-Life Management and Recycling Strategies

End-of-life management of EV batteries presents both significant environmental challenges and opportunities for resource recovery and circular economy implementation. The projected growth in EV battery waste, estimated to reach 11 million tons annually by 2030, necessitates the development of comprehensive recycling and disposal strategies. Current recycling technologies can recover 95% or more of valuable materials from spent batteries, including lithium, cobalt, nickel, and copper, though commercial implementation remains limited due to economic and logistical challenges.

Pyrometallurgical processing represents the most mature recycling technology for lithium-ion batteries, capable of recovering cobalt, nickel, and copper through high-temperature smelting processes. These processes typically operate at temperatures of 1400-1500°C, requiring significant energy input but achieving high recovery rates for valuable metals. The pyrometallurgical route produces an alloy containing cobalt, nickel, and copper that can be further processed to battery-grade materials, though lithium recovery is generally not economically viable through this route.

Hydrometallurgical recycling processes offer more selective recovery of battery materials through chemical leaching and precipitation techniques. These processes typically achieve 90-98% recovery rates for lithium, cobalt, nickel, and manganese while operating at much lower temperatures than pyrometallurgical methods. Hydrometallurgical processing requires careful management of chemical reagents and waste streams but can produce high-purity materials suitable for direct use in new battery production.

Direct recycling approaches aim to recover and reuse battery materials without breaking down the crystal structure of active materials. These processes, while still in development, offer the potential for lower energy consumption and higher material recovery rates compared to conventional recycling. Direct recycling techniques include physical separation, selective dissolution, and electrochemical processing, each with specific advantages for different battery chemistries and degradation states.

Second-life applications for EV batteries that no longer meet automotive performance requirements present opportunities for extending battery useful life and delaying recycling needs. Stationary energy storage applications, including grid storage and residential backup power systems, can utilize batteries with 70-80% of their original capacity. These second-life applications can extend the total useful life of EV batteries by 10-15 years, significantly improving the overall environmental performance and resource utilization efficiency.

Economic factors significantly influence the viability and environmental impact of battery recycling operations. The fluctuating prices of recovered materials, particularly cobalt and lithium, affect the economic sustainability of recycling processes. Government policies, including extended producer responsibility programs and recycling mandates, play crucial roles in establishing stable market conditions for battery recycling. The development of local recycling infrastructure can reduce transportation costs and environmental impacts while supporting circular economy objectives.

Collection and logistics systems for end-of-life batteries present logistical challenges that affect both economic viability and environmental impact. Safe transportation of spent batteries requires specialized containers and handling procedures due to fire and toxic exposure risks. The geographic distribution of EV adoption and recycling facilities necessitates efficient collection networks to minimize transportation-related environmental impacts while ensuring proper handling of hazardous materials.

Regulatory frameworks and safety standards for battery recycling continue to evolve as the industry develops. International standards for battery transportation, handling, and processing ensure worker safety and environmental protection while facilitating trade in recycled materials. The harmonization of recycling standards and regulations across different regions can support the development of efficient global recycling networks and reduce barriers to material recovery.

Table 5 Recycling Method

Recycling Method	Recovery Rates (%)	Energy Consumption	Capital Investment	Material Quality
Pyrometallurgical	Co:95%, Ni:95%, Cu:95%	15-25 kWh/kg	High	Medium
Hydrometallurgical	Li:90%, Co:98%, Ni:95%	5-15 kWh/kg	Medium	High
Direct Recycling	>95% (all materials)	2-8 kWh/kg	Medium	Very High
Mechanical Sorting	80-90% (by mass)	1-3 kWh/kg	Low	Low

4. Conclusion

The comprehensive life cycle assessment of electric vehicle batteries reveals a complex environmental profile characterized by significant impacts during raw material extraction and manufacturing phases, variable impacts during the use phase depending on electricity grid composition, and substantial opportunities for impact reduction through improved end-of-life management. The analysis demonstrates that while EV batteries require substantial energy and resource inputs during production, their overall environmental performance can be significantly improved through strategic interventions across all lifecycle phases.

Raw material extraction emerges as a critical environmental hotspot, with lithium, cobalt, and nickel production contributing disproportionately to the overall environmental burden. The geographic concentration of these resources in regions with varying environmental and social standards highlights the importance of responsible sourcing and supply chain management. Continued development of alternative battery chemistries with reduced dependence on critical materials, such as lithium iron phosphate and emerging solid-state technologies, offers pathways for reducing these upstream impacts.

Manufacturing processes present both challenges and opportunities for environmental improvement. The high energy intensity of battery production, particularly during electrode coating and formation cycling, suggests that manufacturing location and electricity grid composition play crucial roles in determining the overall carbon footprint. The implementation of renewable energy sources in manufacturing facilities and continued improvements in process efficiency can significantly reduce the environmental impact of battery production.

The use phase environmental performance of EV batteries is intrinsically linked to the broader energy system transformation toward renewable sources. As electricity grids continue to decarbonize, the operational environmental benefits of electric vehicles will increase correspondingly. The development of smart charging systems and vehicle-to-grid technologies offers additional opportunities for optimizing the environmental performance of EV batteries during their operational phase.

End-of-life management represents perhaps the greatest opportunity for improving the environmental performance of EV batteries through circular economy approaches. The development of efficient recycling technologies and second-life applications can significantly extend the useful life of battery materials and reduce the demand for virgin resource extraction. Policy support for recycling infrastructure development and extended producer responsibility programs will be essential for realizing these environmental benefits.

The comparative assessment of different battery chemistries reveals trade-offs between performance, cost, and environmental impact that must be carefully considered in battery design and selection decisions. While high-energy-density chemistries like NMC and NCA offer superior vehicle performance, they also carry higher environmental burdens due to their cobalt and nickel content. Lower-impact chemistries like LFP may be more appropriate for certain applications where energy density requirements are less stringent.

Future research priorities should focus on developing more comprehensive assessment methodologies that account for emerging technologies, improved data collection from commercial operations, and better integration of social and economic factors alongside environmental impacts. The rapid pace of technological development in the battery industry necessitates continuous updating of LCA models and assumptions to maintain relevance and accuracy.

References

[1] Dunn, J.B., Gaines, L., Kelly, J.C., James, C., & Gallagher, K.G. (2015). The significance of Li-ion batteries in electric vehicle life-cycle energy and emissions and recycling's role in its reduction. Energy & Environmental Science, 8(1), 158-168.

[2] Ellingsen, L.A.W., Majeau-Bettez, G., Singh, B., Srivastava, A.K., Valøen, L.O., & Strømman, A.H. (2014). Life cycle assessment of a lithium-ion battery vehicle pack. Journal of Industrial Ecology, 18(1), 113-124.

[3] Hawkins, T.R., Singh, B., Majeau-Bettez, G., & Strømman, A.H. (2013). Comparative environmental life cycle assessment of conventional and electric vehicles. Journal of Industrial Ecology, 17(1), 53-64.

[4] Kim, H.C., Wallington, T.J., Arsenault, R., Bae, C., Ahn, S., & Lee, J. (2016). Cradle-to-gate emissions from a commercial electric vehicle Li-ion battery: a comparative analysis. Environmental Science & Technology, 50(14), 7715-7722.

[5] Majeau-Bettez, G., Hawkins, T.R., & Strømman, A.H. (2011). Life cycle environmental assessment of lithium-ion and nickel metal hydride batteries for plug-in hybrid and battery electric vehicles. Environmental Science & Technology, 45(10), 4548-4554.

[6] Notter, D.A., Gauch, M., Widmer, R., Wäger, P., Stamp, A., Zah, R., & Althaus, H.J. (2010). Contribution of Li-ion batteries to the environmental impact of electric vehicles. Environmental Science & Technology, 44(17), 6550-6556.

[7] Peters, J.F., Baumann, M., Zimmermann, B., Braun, J., & Weil, M. (2017). The environmental impact of Li-ion batteries and the role of key parameters–a review. Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, 67, 491-506.

[8] Romare, M., & Dahllöf, L. (2017). The life cycle energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions from lithium-ion batteries. IVL Swedish Environmental Research Institute, Stockholm, Sweden.

[9] Sullivan, J.L., & Gaines, L. (2012). Status of life cycle inventories for batteries. Energy Conversion and Management, 58, 134-148.

[10] Zackrisson, M., Avellán, L., & Orlenius, J. (2010). Life cycle assessment of lithium-ion batteries for plug-in hybrid electric vehicles–critical issues. Journal of Cleaner Production, 18(15), 1519-1529.